

Page Denied

CONFIDENTIAL

Executive Registry
81-2152/7
DDA Registry
81-1403/5

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director, Office of Policy and Planning

FROM: Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

SUBJECT: Approval of Recommendation from Inspector General's Report on the Office of Public Affairs

1. The DCI has approved Recommendation V. B in the Inspector General's August 1981 report on the Office of Public Affairs. This report reads as follows:

V. B. The Director, Office of Policy and Planning, in coordination with the Deputy Director for Administration and the Director, NFAC, ensure that sufficient personnel and financial resources are made available for the development and implementation of an automated data storage and retrieval system for the Publications Review Board.

2. Please coordinate with the DDA and the Director, NFAC on this recommendation and advise me when action is completed.



STAT

B. R. INMAN
Admiral, U.S. Navy

cc: DDA
Director, NFAC

CONFIDENTIAL

Computer Support for PRB

Every PRB member interviewed, as well as other officers involved in the PRB process, expressed concern over the increasingly difficult task of keeping track of intelligence-related information which has found its way into the public domain. Failure to develop a comprehensive institutional memory of material released to the public hastens the day when the Agency will be embarrassed (and possibly sued) because it denies an author the right to publish material which it has already made publicly available.

Public release of intelligence data occurs in various ways including: Agency responses to FOIA and Privacy Act requests, Executive Branch disclosures, Congressional testimony and publications, unclassified Agency publications, publications by current and former Agency officers, and unauthorized leaks. Only portions of this material, such as information released by the DO under FOIA, is stored in automated data bases and is readily retrievable. Reviewers rely heavily on human memory and time-consuming, manual file searches to attempt to determine whether information has become public. The Agency's human memory is swiftly eroding due to retirements and other departures. The rising volume of new manuscripts and other materials published and in preparation by former employees further compounds the problem.

Agency managers including the DPA have taken some initial steps to cope with this situation. At the PRB Conference held in November 1980, the ranking agenda issue was the need to develop an adequate data storage mechanism to enable the Board to record and rapidly retrieve intelligence-related material appearing in publications the PRB itself had reviewed and approved.

Before the Conference there had been discussions about developing a storage and retrieval system which would include all disclosures made by the Agency, but the concept

CONFIDENTIAL

V. - 14

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

had been rejected by senior Agency management as too expensive. The Conference focused on the narrower issue of developing a storage and retrieval system solely to record material reviewed by the PRB. Conference participants unanimously supported the development of such a system; however, no one volunteered to undertake the task.

Subsequently the DPA chose to use OPA's own resources to create a small staff and begin the groundwork to build the system. Accordingly, the DDCI on 10 December 1980 approved the DPA's proposal to establish "a small research/library staff to index manuscripts reviewed and, using existing Agency systems, to assist the Board in the future by identifying and locating specific materials officially declassified or released . . ." (Later the current DDCI approved the reprogramming of \$29,000 of OPA funds to proceed with putting the supplemental volumes of the Church Committee report and the Pike Committee report into an existing full-text automated storage system in OCR--the Rapid Search Machine. Other frequently used documents already stored and available are the basic Church Committee and the Rockefeller Commission reports. OCR has agreed to explore storage of the Pentagon Papers in the same system.)

In March 1981 DPA assigned the task of studying the alternatives for a suitable mechanism to a professional in the PPPRS. She has held extensive discussions with officers in the key components engaged in the PRB review process to develop a clear picture of component and reviewer needs.* The Office of Data Processing (ODP) has made a preliminary survey of the PRB's requirements and concurs that "the PRB application is a good candidate for ADP control." ODP recommends as a next step the formation of a "file design team," composed of a PRB representative, a computer system

*This employee began several months of leave without pay in May 1981. Her position was abolished on 1 July 1981, and her duties have been assumed by other Public Affairs officers.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

analyst from ODP, and an indexing expert from OCR, which would be responsible for a complete system design proposal.

Implementation of the system will require a commitment of resources on ODP's part, in terms of computer and software support, and on the part of the External Affairs Staff, in terms of the personnel necessary for abstracting and indexing the information to be retrieved, as well as data input and file maintenance. ODP has indicated its readiness to support this effort, but the PRB will need the backing of senior management to ensure that all necessary resources are made available.

~~Stopping the Books: Beyond the PRB~~

~~While PRB members and other senior managers expressed general satisfaction with the PRB mechanism, there continues to be widespread concern about the Agency's failure to find a way to discourage former officers from writing books detrimental to the Agency. Everyone concedes that it is difficult to deter disaffected ex-officers like Agee or Stockwell from publishing their views, even by taking legal action against them. But much damaging writing comes from former officers seeking to defend the Agency, or at least their own careers, who seem unaware of the adverse impact their works may have on current Agency equities, personnel and operations. Moreover, their efforts result in a serious drain on the time of PRB members and component reviewers.~~

~~We heard several proposals for discouraging such writing in the future. All present difficulties. For example, some officers advocate further strengthening of the secrecy agreement or extracting a signed statement from new DO employees that they will never write or talk publicly about the clandestine service or their own activities. This, OGC advises us, would run counter to the First Amendment and be legally unenforceable.~~

~~Others believe management should seek to prevent DO officers from lifting their cover status on retirement. Recent efforts to tighten the guidelines under which cover~~

CONFIDENTIAL